DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 457 159 SP 040 263

AUTHOR Jyrhama, Riitta
TITLE What Are the "Right" Questions and the "Right" Answers in Teaching Practice Supervision?
PUB DATE 2001-09-00
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Study Association on Teachers and Teaching (Faro, Portugal, September 21-25, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Feedback; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Questioning Techniques; *Reflective Teaching; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Teacher Supervision; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Finland; *Reflective Thinking

ABSTRACT

This paper links the problem of questioning and answering in student teacher supervision with teachers' pedagogical thinking. The first section discusses whether asking the right questions or giving the right answers is more important and what is actually involved when the questions and answers are correct. The second section discusses the difference between professional development that follows a set pattern and professional development that promotes reflective thinking. The third section examines direct versus indirect supervision. The fourth section considers whether supervisor advice is actually useful, providing data from research on the advice and guidelines given to Finnish student teachers by their supervisors. The data showed that student teachers asked for, and supervisors gave, advice and guidelines. About 60 percent of the students considered the advice practical, and a small percentage of the students considered it useless. The fifth section concludes that the right questions are "why" questions, which make students justify their actions and which direct students' attention to relevant points regarding successful teaching. The right answers are the guidelines that supervisors give students to help them progress, following a careful evaluation of a situation. (Contains 47 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 457 159

# What are the "right" questions and the "right" answers in teaching practice supervision?

RIITTA JYRHAMA

Riitta Jyrhämä

ISATT' 2001
The International Study Association on Teachers and Teaching Conference
Faro, Portugal, September, 21.-25.2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Riitta Jyrhämä
Department of Teacher Education
The Centre for Research on Teaching
P.O.Box 38 (Ratakatu 6 A)
00014 University of Helsinki, Finland
phone +358 9 19128135, GSM +358 50 5231561
e-mail: riitta.jyrhama@helsinki.fi
http://www.helsinki.fi/~jyrhama/

SP040263

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Riitta Jyrhämä
Abstract ISATT 2001

**What are the "right" questions and the "right" answers in teaching practice supervision?**

Which is more important, to ask the "right" questions or to answer the questions "right"? If the question is irrelevant, it is no sin to answer "right". What is then the right way to ask or to guide students and what is the right way to answer or to react. In this paper I link the problemacy of asking and answering the teacher's pedagogical thinking in the context of teaching practice supervision.

The supervisors, often called experts in literature, are expected to possess useful knowledge that novices do not yet have. This knowledge is explicated to the students during supervision by asking questions and giving advice, etc. The character of a supervisor's professional knowledge is implicit. Implicit concepts of knowledge are usually regarded as elements of expertness. The supervisors have their own practical rules, principles, images and professional knowledge in the background and they advise the students. This kind of advice can be called teaching recipes. The supervisor's pedagogical decision-making actually consists of giving advice and guidelines. How oblique the student experiences advice is based on the supervisor's way of serving it. The more direct supervising style emphasizes details and favours lists of guidelines, in other words giving "right" answers on a plate. An "indirect" supervisor has a more discussive and question-setting style, which also includes pedagogical alternatives. S/he draws the students' attention to relevant issues and asks right kinds of questions.

The paper is based for a piece of my research, where the respondents were asked about the advice and guidelines the supervisors had given and were the students were asked about their views of teaching practice? The respondents were supervisors (N=196) and students (N=226) from the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Helsinki. The findings show that supervisors give a lot of advice and guidelines and that the students also ask for them. The students' views of teaching practice gave information on the reasons for following or for not following the advice, on the quality of the supervisory relationship and on curricular considerations. The quality of interaction was found central to the supervisory relationship. The findings also show that teaching recipes can be used as cognitive tools in teacher education and, well-timed, they can help the student to move towards self-directiveness and her/his own practical theory.

Keywords: Teachers' pedagogical thinking, advice, teaching recipe, description, prescription, supervision

## What are the "right" questions and the "right" answers in teaching practice supervision?

### Expert advice: giving an answer or asking a lead-up question?

Which is more important, asking the right questions or giving the right answers? An irrelevant question makes for an irrelevant answer. What is actually involved when the questions and answers are correct? This paper links the problems of questioning and answering with the interaction involved in teaching practice supervision together with teachers' pedagogical thinking.

In teacher education, the advice and guidelines given during teaching practice help students to acquire necessary professional skills. They are thought to help the student to find her/his own professional quality. They are supposed to have the kind of knowledge that beginners, or novices, still lack. Professional knowledge is implicit. In the supervisory situation, this professional knowledge is explicated, brought under scrutiny, i.e. the student is made aware of it. This is brought about through discussion in which both of the participants ask questions and give answers.

The relevant knowledge inherent in expertise is made more explicit by investigating how the supervisors, who are experienced teachers, come up with their instructions. These instructions, based on their knowledge, ideas and beliefs, are meant for themselves, their pupils or their students. In a way, the supervisor thinks out aloud when giving advice and guidelines to the student teacher. At the same time, the supervisor expresses, directly or indirectly, what s/he thinks is relevant to good teaching.

Teacher education is beneficial to research on teachers' pedagogical thinking. Research provides valuable insights into what teachers think. At the same time, it gives information about how the teachers achieve successful interaction and about any other processes involved in their supervisory role.

Becoming an expert is not a rapid process, for holistic mastery of intrinsically complicated matters requires maturity. An expert is able to distinguish relevant factors

in a given and even confusing situation, and to act accordingly. A teaching situation is an intrinsically complicated situation. The pre-service novice may have acquired a lot of theoretical knowledge, which s/he may have combined with her/his own practical theory. In spite of being based on good practical theory, teaching may lack fluency at the early stages of working life, for the situational command of teaching requires the operationalisation of practical theories. Experts seem to have more knowledge than novices do. Research on the different thought processes of experienced teachers and beginners has been particularly active since the late 1980s (e.g. Glaser, 1987; Chi, Glaser & Farr (Eds.), 1988; Berliner & Carter, 1989; Clark, 1989; Livingston & Borko, 1989; Carter, 1990; Bernstein Colton & Sparks-Langer, 1993).

Bromme (1992) describes a teacher as a professionally experienced expert. According to Bromme, expert knowledge is practically oriented and situational, and it does not conform to the paradigmatic classifications or categorisations of pedagogy (educational theory). Expertise develops through experience. Knowledge is an integral part of expertise, but even then, education and expertise do not necessarily come hand in hand. It is essential to know how to use that knowledge. The application of knowledge and skills to new but similar situations enhances expertise. Research on the thinking of experienced teachers and beginners has shown that novices have less sensitivity to the contextual factors of teaching and learning environments than do experienced teachers. That is why rules and recipes are important to them (Berliner, 1988, 1994). The differences between experienced teachers and novices are reflected e.g. in dealing with pupils' learning difficulties, in their views of knowledge, and in the quality of reflection in the actual work context. Novices teach in a subject-oriented manner while experienced teachers pay more attention to students' needs (Schempp et al., 1998, 12, 14) According to Sternberg and Horwath (1995), experts differ from novices in their greater knowledge, more efficient problem solving and deeper insight.

Not unlike other teachers, teaching practice supervisors also form their own implicit theories and beliefs about teaching and learning; these then guide their own work as teachers, but are very difficult to make explicit. Everyone has some spontaneous didactic knowledge, which Buchmann (1987) calls 'folkways of teaching' and Kroksmark

(1990) 'autodidaktik'. Jank and Meyer (1991, 40-45) talk about 'Unterrichtsbild', a concept they use to describe holistic and practical impressions of good or bad teaching, atmosphere, prerequisites and results. Jank and Meyer emphasise the fact that, in order to be able to qualitatively improve one's own teaching, it is vital to become conscious of the structure and quality of the ideas about teaching that one has internalised during one's own school days. When theoretical knowledge combines with a person's earlier experiences and values, a personal teaching theory begins to develop. This kind of theory has been called a subjective theory, theory of practice, practical theory or implicit theory (see e.g. Marland, 1995). The concepts mirror the nature of implicit theories. Mitchell (1994, 71), e.g., has collected from earlier research expressions such as aims, beliefs, goals, expectations, values, conceptions, images, metaphors, rules, principles, and models of practice. The supervisor makes use of her/his practical theory in dialogue with the student. Practical theories comprise both intuitive and rational components, which the teacher has assimilated into her/his own thinking and which s/he continually uses to form her/his own practical theory. Eventually, the supervisor's own preferences determine whether the student gets an answer to her/his question or whether the answer is another question.

**From routines towards self-directedness: recipes versus reflection**

It has been established that a teacher's professional development follows a set pattern. Olson and Bruner (1996) talk about everyday psychology and pedagogy underlying teachers' work. Teacher education should combine the intuitive conceptions of everyday psychology and pedagogy with scientific theory. Olson and Bruner see the teacher as a model, a presenter, a collaborator and a supervisor (or a consultant, a knowledge manager). The roles result from the teacher's conception of the learner. The corresponding learner's roles are those of a doer, knower, thinker and 'expert'. In good teaching, all metaphors based on these roles are necessary, for from the cognitive point of view, certain basic skills have to become automatic before an individual can have enough resources for higher-level problem solving. According to Olson and Bruner (1996), to

achieve any results, it is necessary to have strong pedagogical support from the teacher. With this support, the pupil or the student can find her/his way to self-directedness and deeper conceptual understanding. Asking for advice is one stage in the problem-solving process that is intrinsic to learning - this applies to pupils as well as students. The student's own metacognitive thinking develops gradually, its development having started with mnemonics and unconnected learning skills. While the metacognitive skills take shape, the conception of the teacher changes: first a doer, then an authority and a colleague, and finally an adviser.

The development of a teacher's pedagogical thinking can be described in terms of levels of thinking. Kansanen (1993) distinguishes three levels. On the lowest or action level (1), the teacher's decisions are based on situational basic teaching skills. On the object level (2), the events of the action level are analysed by means of theoretical concepts and models. This requires mastery of the subject as well as the ability to teach it. The teacher then applies her/his own practical theories. On the metalevel (3), the analysis is directed to the decisions of the previous level, to syntheses and to justifications. The basis for a teacher's actions becomes more scientific with the higher levels of thinking. Teachers' pedagogical decision-making and justifications are analysed in more detail in the work by Kansanen, Tirri, Meri, Krokfors, Husu and Jyrhämä (2000). As a rule, teachers justify their decisions both intuitively and rationally. In other words, a teacher's pedagogical decisions are founded on experiential as well as theoretical knowledge. Justification of action as such tends to enhance a teachers' pedagogical thinking.

In their roles as teaching practice supervisors, teachers have to tackle the justifications for their own actions with more than usual care, for students ask them for a lot of advice. According to Carr and Kemmis (1986), the conceptions of good teaching underlying a teacher's actions contain practical everyday knowledge or common sense, popular and traditional wisdom, practical know-how, circumstantial knowledge, professional knowledge, and educational knowledge as well as social, moral and philosophical assumptions.

Supervisors meet students' needs for advice with a variety of supervisory methods. Depending on emphasis, teaching practice supervision can be described in terms of

mentoring, counselling, etc. When the effects of programmes for improving working conditions have been studied, a method in which a senior colleague advises her/his junior colleagues has been found to be positive as a rule (Firestone & Pennell, 1993). An older and more experienced colleague, i.e. a teacher in the role of a teaching practice supervisor, has already formed her/his own knowledge base of pedagogical thinking. Orientation to practical knowledge can happen by means of the situation or practical work and routines; by means of one's own personality or one's personal way of action; through experience, theory or social context (Elbaz, 1981). Structurally, Elbaz analyses practical knowledge into rules of practice, practical principles and images, with which the teacher constructs and organises her/his practical knowledge. Rules of practice in Elbaz's usage are clear and concise recipes for practical teaching situations. With the help of these recipes, the teacher is able to decide which course of action to take in recurring teaching situations if s/he recognises the type of situation and remembers the relevant piece of advice. Practical principles directing and explicating the teacher's choice of action are more general and have their basis in reflection derived from practical experience. (Elbaz, 1981, 60-61.)

Supervisory dialogue can be open or technical. Open dialogue is characterised by shared wonderment, an investigative attitude accompanied by unconditional mutual respect. The idea is to gain insight into changing reality. In open dialogue, the emphasis is more on responsive listening than on spoken response. Technical dialogue is characterised by its emphasis on knowing rather than on wondering (regarded as equal to ignorance). Perception is limited, not mutually responsive or appreciative in a genuine way. (Ojanen, 2000, 64-65.)

**Questions or answers: nondirectiveness and directiveness of supervision**

In addition to theoretical knowledge, the teaching practice supervisors act in accordance with their own rules of practice, principles and images. They give student teachers guidelines and advice, which can also be called recipes, tips, rules of thumb etc. and which are derived from their own professional lore. Advice and guidelines can be either

oral or written. The supervisor's personal tone eventually determines how binding the student finds the advice. A supervisory style with an emphasis on detail indicates recipe-like regulation aimed at helping the student move forward from the actual situation. Discussion is typical of a style open to alternative pedagogical solutions. Students then form their own conclusions based on what they hear. Ultimately, it is for the individual student to decide whether to take or ignore the advice given.

The supervisory relationship is a two-way interaction: the behaviour of one participant necessarily influences the other. A skilful supervisor starts by sounding the student out about her/his needs. S/he adapts her/his supervision to the situation. The principles of demand and supply become relevant: if there is demand, i.e. the student is looking for advice and guidelines, the supervisor supplies them; if there is supply, students may want to ask for even more. The fact that supply exists does not necessarily imply directiveness of supervision; it can also be nondirective, indirect availability, which communicates itself to the student as the supervisor's sensitivity and readiness to provide additional help if and when necessary. In an interactive relationship, aiming at symmetry brings equality to supervisory discourse, but even then, the supervisor is the one with expertise and authority. If this authority is based on a person being *an authority* and not only on a person being *in authority*, the supervisor's advice is of genuinely high value. (See Steutel & Spicker, 2000, 325.)

A supervisor's competence can be seen in situations where different kinds of students have expressed their satisfaction with her/his supervision. If a student has needed concrete, direct answers in problem situations and has felt that s/he has received them, s/he has been satisfied. Correspondingly, if the same supervisor has, upon request, given some very general ideas, more in the way of stimulating questioning than of giving direct answers, also that student has been satisfied. The expert's way of responding is characterised by sensitivity to the student's needs and by finding the right methods. Why then is some other supervisor's performance is assessed by one student a very good and by another as very bad? In this kind of situation, it is likely that two different students have made the assessment, which means that the supervisor has successfully dealt with one but not with the other. It would also imply that the supervisor

has used the same method with both the students, that is, s/he has not changed her/his own behaviour to meet the differing needs of two different students. This outcome cannot be as successful as that of a flexible supervisor. Experiences of this kind are likely to give rise to stories of legendary supervisors and teachers that are the creation of previous student generations. It is not rare that those working in teaching professions become targets for this kind of stories, as a united effort of different student generations. Sometimes they can precondition the new supervisory relationship, and a negative preconception does not make a very good starting-point for supervision. As regards the supervisors who do not modify their own actions to suit the student's needs, the student begins to adapt her/himself to the supervisor's wishes. Teaching practice then becomes a survival story where the student's own pedagogical thinking is hardly discernible. In all fairness, sometimes students' decisions are so original or negligent of their pupils that the supervisor's demands for a certain type of action are justified. These cases may reflect a student's inadequate sense of reality or mere laziness. More often than not, the student eventually comes to terms with her/his situation.

**Is free advice worth it?**

There is a Finnish saying 'those who are experienced know everything'. The saying regards wisdom based on experience as a positive thing. I have asked myself whether those who are experienced really know everything (Jyrhämä, 2000b). When supervising teaching practice those who are experienced, i.e. the experts, give the uninitiated, i.e. the novices, advice for teaching situations. Students are quite eager to obtain recipes. They may ask for advice in order to reflect their own performance and to test their own thinking. But is free advice worth it?

Meyer considers recipes to be practical guidelines for teaching that consist of explicit and implicit assumptions of practical situations and goal setting. Recipes are not theoretically formulated or empirically justified, even in cases where this is possible. The justification of recipes comes with their successful application. Critical reflection is then crucial. Advice and guidelines should be good: pedagogically legitimate, theoreti-

cally derived and empirically verified. The recipient should also be sensible when applying them; s/he should avoid false generalisations; s/he should notice the implicit prerequisites and goals of the recipes. (Meyer, 1991, 46-51.) On the other hand, Harrison (1978, 71-72) sees recipes as practical cognitive tools, and as such, they can be used in a good or bad manner. A written recipe is a small piece of theory; a hypothetical view of how, by doing such-and-such, you will get such-and-such results.

According to Dunn and Taylor (1993), expertise cannot be formally taught but it can be learned in practical situations. They define a piece of advice as a recommendation for preferred action given to student by the supervisor. More advanced professionals should use supervising strategies that encourage the student to see the kind of relationships and regularities that foster the development of conceptual knowledge. The supervising strategy does not teach intellectual skills directly, but higher-level rules can later be used in problem solving. This results from transfer, in which situations are analysed in new contexts analogical to students' earlier experiences (Salomon & Perkins, 1989; Perkins & Salomon, 1988).

Putnam describes different developmental stages in using recipes. At first, the novice uses recipes as models. Lack of experience often leaves the novice in the right place, which is passable when s/he does 'what s/he is expected to do', that is, when s/he does what the expert would do in the same situation. It is typical of the second stage that the use of recipes becomes the focus of attention, as pieces of wider strategies of a new practical theory, which means more reasoning. At the third stage, the learner becomes competent, at least sporadically, to deal with information by way of putting it in a context. This is how s/he takes her/his own stance in the situation. This, then, means independent use of the recipes. Good recipes, according to Putnam, are useful because they give useful information even if they are employed in the same way as a model during intervention. On the other hand, recipes are easy to remember, and under stress, it is often helpful that recipes are so easy to quickly recall and that they serve as an index of concepts, models and methods. In addition, good recipes help to focus reflection on the object by way of easy recall. This is their strength. (Putnam, 1991, 160-162.)

If one and the same person takes care of both asking and answering, the outcome should be satisfactory. As far as recipes are concerned, reflective thinking is also necessary. In fact, reflecting on recipes is an obvious prerequisite for their sensible employment. The supervisor tunes the student's metacognition. The student then starts to ask questions and to look for solutions. The supervisor should help the student to conceptualise her/his experiences. Putnam warns against using recipes in a way that prevents a holistic view.

Learning means different models, and the more advanced models presuppose changes in the human values and attitudes included in the formation of practical theory. The use of recipes and an advanced model of learning stand in a paradoxical relation to each other in that the recipes, which can be seen as seemingly superficial techniques only, can be crucial in the formation of a new practical theory. (Putnam, 1991, 145-147.)

My research[1] (Jyrhämä, 1999, 2000a, 2000b) on the advice and guidelines given during teaching practice in the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Helsinki shows that they have mostly dealt with the teaching process, teaching methods and interaction. They are admittedly central factors in making teaching successful. I classified the advice and guidelines into main content categories according to subject, which were then divided into following groups in order of size: Teaching methods (24.1%), interaction (23.3%), practical teaching arrangements (13.6%), subject (9.0%), planning (7.4%) and evaluation (2.8%). The findings show that student teachers mostly received quite detailed recipes, including the following.

- Get acquainted with your pupils.
- Be an all-rounder in your choice of methods.
- Learn a logical way of asking questions.
- Give your pupils clear-cut instructions.
- Vary your choice of audiovisual equipment.
- Be a friendly and consistent adult in your relationship with your pupils.
- Guide and encourage your pupils to think and use their own judgement.
- Approach your subject in a didactically tenable manner, and try not to teach everything at once.

[1] Total N = 426, supervisors N = 196, students N = 226

The students (n=55) assessed the usefulness of the received recipes in terms of their being *concrete, practicable, matter-of-fact, positive, thought-provoking and applicable in future working life.* Of the women 60% and all the men felt that the recipes were practicable. Moreover, 30% of the women conveyed that the recipes were practicable to varying degrees, i.e. sometimes the supervisor had succeeded in giving the right kind of advice and sometimes not. Only about one of ten female students felt that the recipes she had received were utterly useless. The students who felt that the received recipes were useless referred, among other things, to *their own individual ways of doing things, to the fact that the recipes were too situation-bound or not easily generalisable, to their triviality, and to matters of taste.* The practical usefulness of the recipes seemed to depend on *the giver of the advice* and *the student's previous teaching experience,* which helps her/him to assess the practicability of the recipes. (Jyrhämä, 2000b.)

One particular characteristic comes up in regard to the usefulness of the advice, namely an awareness of its concreteness as opposed to its abstractness. While *some students especially demand concreteness, others see it as a hindrance and appreciate only abstract advice on a very general and theoretical level.* The following two answers reflected both positive and negative views on the concreteness and abstractness of the recipes.

> In some instances, I would have wished for more supervision, quite concrete recipes, not just somebody telling you to be creative but getting a concrete tip to begin with.

> Direct concrete recipes didn't suit me as such. For me the most useful situations were those where I could or where I had to weigh and reflect on the matter and different alternatives and the like, first on my own. Then I had the opportunity to discuss my views with the supervisor, to get feedback, tips and new angles and after that, to decide independently which line of action to take. On the other hand, it was impossible to follow a supervisor's concrete recipe if it was not justified in any way or it conflicted with my own views or with what suits my personality.

These quotations concretely demonstrate the positive and negative reactions to a supervisor's conduct in a given situation.

**Thinking about the right things and asking the right questions**

A supervisor's expertise can be seen in the fact that he or she tries to direct the student's attention to relevant points and arouse her/his self-reflection. Drawing attention to points that are relevant to teaching creates a favourable basis for supervision. As a rule, students find that by paying attention to the points brought up by the supervisor, they are more likely to succeed. Copeland and D'Emidio-Caston (1998, 518-521) explain by educational purposes and by a higher awareness of them, the changes that take place in students' practical theories. This came with cumulative teaching experience.

In teaching practice and supervisory situations, the student and the supervisor test their own practical theories, their implicit/inner sets of rules. The practical theory of a supervisor or a student is a controlling system or a personal code of action. Ojanen (2000, 17) mentions supervisory practices that have become a set of rules. If the purposes behind those rules are not known, the rules remain unconnected, without any deeper significance. A rule that has proved its value is worth further investigation. It is good to examine why a recipe worked so well and to analyse all the factors contributing to its success. Not all recipes work so well. A supervisor may have made a misjudgement or the application may have faltered. The process by which the student approaches meaningful learning as well as discovery learning is also a process towards constructivist thinking. The student then applies the received didactic recipes and finds her/his own generalisations. S/he can also combine the new insight with the ones s/he already has internalised into a meaningful whole.

In the spirit of constructivist epistemic ideas, one might think that a postmodern student would not be given direct advice and guidelines but that s/he would be expected to construct her/his recipes and methods of work for her/himself. S/he is thought to have empowered her/himself to act independently. Advice and guidelines seem to have kept their popularity. Whereas asking for advice used to be considered a sign of dependence, it is now regarded as a positive factor in learning and as a learning strategy. In a successful supervisory relationship, the student has experienced the supervisor's undivided attention and availability. The student has been able to actively seek for advice. Ac-

cording to Puustinen (1999), asking for advice figures positively in learning (see Nelson-Le Gall, 1981, 1985; Ames, 1983). Asking for advice has also been analysed as one possible learning strategy (e.g. van der Meij, 1990; Karabenick & Knapp, 1991; Newman, 1994; Butler & Neuman, 1995; Newman & Schwager, 1995). In the process of becoming a professional practitioner, the teacher produces guidelines primarily for her/his own use and is no longer dependent on anybody else's recipes. Her/his autonomy and ability to make decisions will increase. Advice and guidelines from an expert may well be considered intellectual tools for the professional development of an independent-minded teacher.

In addition to being supported by didactic knowledge good advice and guidelines are also supported by values. Even the supervisor should become aware of her/his own disposition, whether it is to control people or to empower them. Advice and guidelines represent normative didactics and, as such, they are charged with values. With the choice of a recipe, the supervisor makes a pedagogical decision which directs her/his action towards eligible, pedagogically valuable goals.

Supervisors do not only advise and hand out recipes to their students ('those who answer questions'), but also largely encourage their students to think ('those who ask questions'). To take an example, Hawkey's analysis of a supervisor discoursing with a student shows that the supervisor's speech largely consisted of giving recipes or information, but also nearly as much of urging the student to develop her/his thinking. (Hawkey, 1998, 336-338.) Mastery of expert knowledge and teaching skills is basic to supervising. Yet, a successful supervisory relationship is essentially characterised by the good quality of interaction. The supervisor's attitude to her/his work and respect for and openness towards the student are crucial factors. Person-to-person discussions help the supervisor to notice the student's individual needs and help to adapt her/his supervision to the student's developmental phase. The amount of recipes can vary considerably. Giving advice and guidelines is one of the supervisory interventions in the process of educating good teachers. Interventions should be properly timed, for non-reflective students feel that they do not learn anything if the pace is too fast. It takes a while to change deep-rooted learning orientations, and the development of teaching skills hap-

pens by phases. (de Jong et al., 1998, 55.) Students need time to become teachers. The process that enables them to adopt reflective skills and improve critical awareness can be speeded up if they start practising right at the beginning of their studies (cf. Järvinen et al., 1995).

It was stated above that skilful people are able to concentrate better on what is essential and find the gist of the matter more effectively than the less skilful. As a rule, a skilful supervisor can justify her/his advice and guidelines and show their underlying intentionality. The expert can make the student more aware of the practicability or impracticability of her/his chosen way of action and can offer alternatives accompanied by justification and explication. A skilful supervising teacher is able to take into account many simultaneous phenomena and to make a correct assessment of a given situation. Thus, s/he is able to give the right recipe when and where necessary. This often happens in the Socratic method, which guides students to look for their own answers. A student teacher brought this up in her/his comment: 'I believe that the supervisor tried to make us students think more in terms of why-questions and take the child's point of view into account.' Another student stated with insight: 'What I find most important is that we are guided to think about the right things.' The right questions are then as important as the right answers.

In the title of this article, I asked what right questions and right answers are in teaching practice supervision. In summary, it can be said that, as a rule, *the right questions are why-questions that make the student justify their actions and which direct the student's attention to relevant points with regard to attaining success in teaching. The right answers, on the other hand, are the recipes supervisors give to students to help them onwards, after a good evaluation of a given situation.* In genuine dialogue, interaction is symmetric and even the student can be the one to ask the right questions and to give the right answers.

**References**

Ames, R. (1983). Help-seeking and achievement orientation: Perspectives from attribution theory. In B. DePaulo, A. Nadler, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *New directions in helping* (pp. 165-186). New York: Academic Press.

Berliner, D. C. (1988). *Implications of studies of expertise in pedagogy for teacher education and evaluation.* New directions for teacher assessment. ETS invitational conference. Princeton: Educational testing service.

Berliner, D. C. (1994). Expertise: the wonder of exemplary performances. In J. Mangieri & C. Block (Eds.), *Creating powerful thinking in teachers and students: diverse perspectives.* Forth Worth: Harcourt Brace College.

Berliner, D., & Carter, K. (1989). Differences in processing classroom information by expert and novice teachers. In J. Lowyck & C. Clark (Eds.), *Teacher thinking and professional action* (pp. 55-74). Leuwen University. Studia paedagogica 9.

Bernstein Colton, A., & Sparks-Langer, G. (1993). A conceptual framework to guide the development of teacher reflection and decision making. *Journal of Teacher Education 44*(1), 45-54.

Bromme, R. (1992). *Der Lehrer als Experte.* Zur Psychologie des professionellen Wissens. Bern: Verlag Hans Huber.

Buchmann, M. (1987). Teaching knowledge: the lights that teachers live by. *Oxford Review of Education, 13*(2), 151-164.

Butler, R., & Neuman, O. (1995). Effects of task and ego achievement goals on help-seeking behaviors and attitudes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*, 261-271.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical.* Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 291-310). New York: Macmillan.

Chi, M., Glaser, R., & Farr, M. (Eds.) (1988). *The nature of expertise.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Clark, C. (1989). Asking the right questions about teacher preparation: Contributions on research on teacher thinking. In J. Lowyck & C. Clark (Eds.), *Teacher thinking and professional action* (pp. 305-323). Leuwen University. Studia paedagogica 9.

Copeland, W.D., & D'Emidio-Caston, M. (1998). Indicators of development of practical theory in pre-service teacher education students. *Teaching and Teacher Education 14*(5), 513-534.

de Jong, J., Korthagen, F., & Wubbels, T. (1998). Learning from practice in teacher education: processes and interventions. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 4*(1), 47-64.

Dunn, T.G., & Taylor, C.A. (1993). Cooperating teacher advice. *Teaching & Teacher Education 9*(4), 411-423.

Elbaz, F. (1981). The Teacher's practical knowledge: Report of a case study. *Curriculum Inquiry 11*(1), 43-71.

Firestone, W.A., & Pennell, J.R. (1993). Teacher commitment, working conditions, and differential incentive policies. *Review of Educational Research, 63*(4), 489-525.

Glaser, R. (1987). Thoughts on expertise. In C. Schooler & W. Schaie (Eds.), *Cognitive functioning and social structure over the life course.* Norwood: Ablex.

Harrison, A. (1978). *Making and thinking: a study of intelligent activities.* Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

Hawkey, K. (1998). Consultative supervision and mentor development: an initial exploration and case study. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 4*(2), 331-348.

Jank, W., & Meyer, H. (1991). *Didaktische Modelle.* Frankfurt am Main: Cornelsen Scriptor.

Jyrhämä, R. (1999a). Ohjeet ja neuvot opetusharjoittelussa. [Advice and guidelines in teaching practice]. *Kasvatus 30*(4), 334-349.

Jyrhämä, R. (2000a). Teaching Recipes and Mixed Patterns of Justification: Some Findings of Teachers' Pedagogical Thinking. A paper presented at the Innovations in Higher Education International Conference in Helsinki, Finland, August, 2000. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education ED 448120.*

Jyrhämä, R. (2000b). The Experienced Know Everything, Don't They? Students' Views on Teaching Practice Supervision. In Meri, M., Uusikylä, K., Talvio, M. & Jyrhämä, R. *Discussions on some pedagogical issues* (pp. 153-192). Research Report 222. Department of Teacher Education. University of Helsinki.

Järvinen, A., Kohonen, V., Niemi, H. & Ojanen, S. (1995). Educating critical professionals. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 39,* 121-137.

Kansanen, P. (1993). An outline for a model of teachers' pedagogical thinking. In P. Kansanen (Ed.), *Discussions on some educational issues IV* (pp. 51-65). Research Report 121. Department of Teacher Education, University of Helsinki.

Kansanen, P., Tirri, K., Meri, M., Krokfors, L., Husu, J., & Jyrhämä, R. (2000). *Teachers' pedagogical thinking. Theoretical landscapes, practical challenges.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Karabenick, S.A., & Knapp, J.R. (1991). Relationship of academic help seeking to the use of learning strategies and other instrumental achievement behavior in college students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83,* 221-230.

Kroksmark, T. (1990). *Fenomenografi och lärares didaktik. Konturer till en innehållbeskrivning av lärares undervisningskompetens.* Göteborgs universitet, Institutionen för metodik i lärarutbildningen.

Livingston, C., & Borko, H. (1989). Expert-novice differences in teaching: a cognitive analysis and implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(4), 36-42.

Marland, P. W. (1995). Implicit theories of teaching. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education* (pp. 131-136). 2.ed. Cambridge: Pergamon.

Meyer, H. (1991). *Leitfaden zur Unterrichtsvorbereitung.* [1. Aufl. 1980] Frankfurt am Main: Cornelsen Scriptor.

Mitchell, J. (1994). Teachers' implicit theories concerning questioning. *British Educational Research Journal 20,* 69-83.

Nelson-Le Gall, S. (1981). Help-seeking: An understudied problem-solving skill in children. *Developmental Review, 1*, 224-246.

Nelson-Le Gall, S. (1985). Help-seeking behavior in learning. *Review of Research in Education 12*, 55-90.

Newman, R.S. (1994). Adaptive help-seeking: A strategy of self-regulated learning. In D.H. Schunk, & B.J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational applications* (pp. 283-301). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Newman, R.S., & Schwager, M.T. (1995). Students' help seeking during problem solving: Effects of grade, goal and prior achievement. *American Educational Research Journal 32*, 352-376.

Ojanen, S. (2000). Ohjauksesta oivallukseen. Ohjausteorian kehittelyä. [From Supervision to Insight: Theory of Supervision in the Making.] Helsingin yliopiston Tutkimus- ja koulutuskekus Palmenia. Palmenia-kustannus. [Palmenia, the Centre for Research and Education. Palmenia Publications.]

Olson, D.R., & Bruner, J.S. (1996). Folk psychology and folk pedagogy. In D.R. Olson, & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The Handbook of Education and Human Developmet. New Models of Learning, Teaching and Schooling*. Blackwell Publisher.

Perkins, D.N., & Salomon, G. (1988). Teaching for transfer. *Educational Leadership, 46*(1), 22-32.

Putnam, R.W. (1991). Recipes and reflective learning: "What would prevent you from saying it that way?" In D. Schön (Ed.), *The reflective turn: case studies in and on educational practice* (145-163). New York: Teacher College Press.

Puustinen, M. (1999). Neuvon kysyminen kouluiässä. [Asking for advice in the schoolage]. *Psykologia 34*, 30-37.

Salomon, G., & Perkins, D.N. (1989). Rocky roads to transfer: Rethinking mechanism of a neglected phenomenon. *Educational Psychologist, 24*, 113-142.

Schempp, P., Tan, S., Manross, D., & Fincher, M. (1998). Differences in novice and competent teachers' knowledge. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 4*(1), 9-20.

Sternberg, R., & Horvath, J. (1995). A prototype view of expert teaching. *Educational Researcher 24*(6), 9-17.

Steutel, J. & Spiecker, B. (2000). Authority in Educational Relationships. *Journal of Moral Education, 29(3)*, 323-337.

van der Meij, H. (1990). Question asking: To know that you do not know is not enough. *Journal of Educational Psychology 82*, 505-512.